

ITEMS

VOLUME 3 • NUMBER 4 • DECEMBER 1949
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN BRITAIN

by Roy F. Nichols*

THIS is a time of unusual social change in Britain and new demands are being made upon social scientists for data and opinion.¹ They are called upon for the answers to questions which can only be given after extensive research. Thus research interests which were not predominant in universities largely dedicated to teaching undergraduates have taken on new importance, and research institutes have assumed new responsibilities.

The influences at work to arouse research interest in social science have been particularly active since the dark days following Britain's entry into World War II. Some of them date from the period of the Lloyd George reforms or even earlier, but it was the last war that really brought research to the fore. Total mobilization for defense, the terrific destruction of the blitz, and the consequent financial and political readjustments made extensive changes and experiments absolutely imperative. Even at the time of the first World War, agencies such as the Medical Research Council and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research had been created to be concerned with problems of research of interest to the government. Among the agencies established after the outbreak of World War II are a Central Office of Information with a division devoted to social surveys, and a Committee on Industrial Productivity which organized a Human Factors Panel under the

chairmanship of Sir George Schuster. This panel meets monthly and has the benefit of a research advisory committee of distinguished social scientists. Since 1943 there has been a Ministry of Town and Country Planning, which is concerned with social science research in many fields in its development of a national policy on land use.

Most of these agencies found immediate need for facts, figures, and research workers. It was not long before government learned that the research talent available was insufficient and scattered, and in order to find remedies the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research was created to ascertain the facts and make recommendations. Sir John Clapham presided over this committee and in 1946 delivered an impressive report on the nature of government involvement with social science research and the steps which might be taken to support such research in the government and in the universities.

In the meantime the government had taken a most significant step. It had organized a University Grants Committee. The changing financial situation in England during the war and postwar years had told heavily upon the incomes of the universities. The government realized that something must be done to keep the institutions of higher learning functioning effectively, and the University Grants Committee was consequently charged with apportioning government money among them. It was found desirable that more than 30 percent of the running expenses of the universities be provided by the Treasury. This committee paid particular heed to the recommendations of the Clapham report and began a series of grants to the universities in aid of research. Grants were likewise received from such private

* Mr. Nichols served as Visiting Professor of American History and Institutions at Cambridge University in 1948-49 and visited the Universities of Birmingham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Nottingham, Oxford, and Reading, Trinity College in Dublin, and the National University of Eire.

¹ See Pendleton Herring, "The Social Sciences in a European Perspective," *SSRC Items*, September 1948.

vate sources as the Leverhulme Trust, the Nuffield Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland.

Outside the universities a number of research organizations were available to participate in social science investigations in one way or another, supported usually by private capital, sometimes in part by government grants. Among these were the Association for Planning and Regional Reconstruction, the Institute of Psychiatry, the Institute of Public Administration, the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, the National Institute of Industrial Psychology, the Political and Economic Planning Trust (PEP), the Population Investigation Committee, and the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. It was my privilege to visit two of these institutes and a number of the universities, and I lived as a Fellow of Trinity at Cambridge for three terms. I found much of interest and I present here some of what I learned about the programs and facilities for research now existing in Britain.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

The National Institute of Economic and Social Research was organized on the eve of World War II by a group who believed that there should be more practical and scientific knowledge of the conditions, particularly economic, obtaining in contemporary society. This institute, supported largely by funds from the Leverhulme Trust and the Nuffield and Rockefeller Foundations, and working under the spur of wartime revelation and the urgency of postwar conditions, has undertaken a significant program. The need for statistics of production and national income, and the problems of industrial location and of consumers' demands and expenditures have been the chief stimuli and have produced a series of studies, some in collaboration with the Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge. Recently studies have been begun under government contract for the Board of Trade. Method and theory are likewise matters of continual concern and study. The Institute publishes annually the *Register of Research in the Social Sciences in Progress and in Plan*, which is a complete listing of work in progress together with its sponsors whether university or institute. The *Register* is an extremely valuable index to social science research in the British Isles and should have wide circulation among social scientists in the United States.²

The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations had its origin in the Tavistock Clinic, which since before World

War I has been dealing primarily with individual ills and maladjustments. During World War II certain psychologists and psychiatrists, some of whom were associated with the clinic, worked together to improve techniques in use in the army. They urged new procedures "for the selection of both officers and men, a new approach to battle conditions, . . . new methods of psychological warfare, . . . and techniques for solving problems of repatriation and resettlement."³ At the close of the war these associates formed the Tavistock Institute with subsidies from the Rockefeller Foundation and the government, to apply these techniques to peacetime problems. They have undertaken to serve as consultants in the field of industrial relations and are maintaining a research and training program, specializing particularly on the problem of reducing group tensions.

Within university circles interest in social science research has brought about new departments and programs. The Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge has been developing a program under the direction of J. R. N. Stone. Its objectives are the improvement of method, the promotion of scientific procedure, and the advance of fundamental research in economic theory as well as in its application. Its initial efforts have been devoted to gathering adequate statistical series, particularly on industrial production and consumers' expenditures. It is working vigorously to secure "the collection of economic data on a systematic basis by means of sampling methods," and at the same time to improve the sampling methods now in use. "It does not deal with day to day practical issues posed by economic policy" but rather with fundamental research in applied economics.⁴ The department has a building, with a library and a statistical laboratory of its own.

The Psychological Laboratory at Cambridge, directed by Sir Frederick C. Bartlett, is engaged in a variety of experiments in human engineering. During the war the speed up in industry and the rapid expansion of air combat necessitated intensive research to find the facts regarding the adjustment of men to machines and machines to men, the limits of human tolerance to fatigue, temperature, machine operation and the like. New knowledge was needed concerning the possibility of measuring skill and the conditions under which skill can reach a maximum. Since the war the growth of labor's power, the controversy over the position of

³ *Social Therapy*, 3(2):4.

⁴ The "First Report" of the Department of Applied Economics was published in November 1948 and is also contained in the *Cambridge University Reporter*, Vol. 79, No. 27 (February 15, 1949).

² No. 6 for 1948-49 was published in July 1949 by the Cambridge University Press and sells for 15s.

British industry, and the interest of government in fact finding in these reactions has led the managers of the laboratory to continue this experimental study.

At Oxford the most recent development in social science research is at Nuffield College, which like the Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge really began to function at the close of the war, under the Wardenship of Sir Henry Clay. This college aims not to develop any established research program but to bring together a group of Fellows with well-developed projects in the social sciences who will write and teach a limited number of students the techniques of their prospective fields. At Oxford, also, is the Institute of Statistics where scholars representing various statistical interests are working on a cooperative program. A third agency is active in the form of the Institute of Social Anthropology where the interest is sufficiently broad to be historical and to encompass contemporary social analysis on all cultural levels. This institute and the Institute of Colonial Studies reflect the scholarly interests in various far places of the Empire which is currently emphasized in university circles.

The University of London, elaborate and confusing as its far-flung federated organization is, reminds an American more of one of his home universities than any other. Here graduate work in the American sense is more active a charge and more direct an interest than elsewhere, and the number of graduate students is larger in proportion to the whole than elsewhere in the British Isles.

Social science research at the London School of Economics is organized in four divisions: colonial (which includes anthropology), economic, government, and social. A research subcommittee for each of these divisions submits an annual research budget to the general Research Committee, which apportions the available funds. The larger part of the teaching force of the London School, numbering 100 in 1948-49, is connected with these divisions. There is a research professor, several research officers, and—what made me envious—a corps of research assistants, typists, and computers. This provision of research assistants could be copied in this country much more widely with great profit. They are invaluable in aiding the various research projects of groups or individuals. These assistants are not a permanent staff; they serve for a few years before taking positions in education or business.

Psychology flourishes at University College under Sir Cyril Burt. Sociology has its only well-established position in England in the London School of Economics under Morris Ginsberg and Thomas H. Marshall. The Department of Social Anthropology under Raymond

Firth, in the same School, is particularly active in colonial research.

The center of social science research interest at the University of Manchester is the Economics Research Section, established in the 1930's largely under the leadership of John Jewkes, then Professor of Social Economics. It received financial aid from the Rockefeller Foundation and used the Lancashire industrial area as its laboratory. After World War II it was reorganized and refinanced and has undertaken a new program, featuring among other problems the study of employment and industrial administration and the improvement of statistical series and techniques. It is now directed by a committee consisting of W. A. Lewis, Professor of Political Economy, Ely Devons, Professor of Applied Economics, Alexander Henderson, Professor of Economic Theory, and W. J. M. McKenzie, Professor of Government. It publishes a journal, the *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, and is financed jointly by the university, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the University Grants Committee. This section is enlarging its scope in a manner which can only be of profit to the social sciences. Michael Polanyi has been appointed Professor of Sociology and efforts are being made to secure a social anthropologist, an economic geographer, a social psychologist, and an authority on industrial relations; but qualified persons are scarce or nonexistent. This breadth of view is reflected in the undergraduate program where reading in sociology is included in the degree in economics and politics.

At Liverpool there has been a Department of Social Science and a School of Social Sciences and Administration for some time, the latter largely designed for training social workers. However, since World War II the current trend toward research has been reflected in a reorganization. T. S. Simey, Professor of Social Science, and Dennis Chapman, senior lecturer and research director, have set up a research section in the department, which with funds from the University Grants Committee and other sources has assembled a research staff of about a dozen persons. They are at work on studies in community planning, problems of old age, and human relations in industry, using particularly the abundant materials supplied by social and economic conditions in the Merseyside area. Administration is in the hands of a Board of Social Studies whose principal members are the professors of economics, social science, and geography. The section does research for government and also under private contract. Liverpool, like Manchester, has difficulty in securing and retaining research personnel; qualified workers are all too few in number.

At Birmingham a board of research was formed in 1948 in the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, in part due to the interest of P. Sargant Florence. This board is charged with planning and coordinating the variety of projects to be developed by that faculty's teaching staff, research fellows and scholars, and graduate students. They have to explore borderlands between disciplines not only of the social sciences but of the biological and physical sciences as well. To date six research teams have been organized to study: industrial incentives and use of manpower; the development and readjustment of Midland industries; legal institutions, accounting, and economic policy; sociological factors in town and country planning; history and economic thought; and intergovernmental relations and practical problems of public administration.

In Scotland similar trends are apparent in the development of research. At Glasgow as a result of the realization of postwar needs a Department of Economics and Social Research was set up in 1946, financed by the university, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the University Grants Committee. It began operations with a program of study of the humanities or way of living in the Clyde area in southwest Scotland. James Cunnison is the director and he has a group of five associates, including a sociologist. The research interests of this department include studies in comparative productivity of Scottish and English industries, development of trade unions, transportation problems, the national income of Scotland, the experience of persons who leave school early, and various problems of local government. A general review of Glasgow social life and opinion is in progress, and a survey of a district of Lanarkshire is being made at the request of the Industrial Development Association of the district. At present Scotland is attempting a Third Statistical Account. As it is more than a hundred years since the second was prepared, the task involves the utilization of many new techniques. The department is making a pilot study of the county of Ayr to guide the Scottish Council of Social Service which has the project in charge.

At Edinburgh a recent development has been the creation of a committee for research in the social sciences, consisting of members of the departments of economics, education, geography, moral philosophy, psychology, social anthropology, social medicine, social study, and statistics, under the chairmanship of the Professor of Moral Philosophy. This committee has just been organized and is still discussing possible fields of research, but it seems probable that problems in the Tweed Valley will first engage its attention.

An American social scientist visiting British universities and surveying these developments is aware of certain contrasts and similarities between the situations at home and abroad. The most marked contrast is found in the prevailing attitude toward sociology. This area so highly regarded in America is suspect in Britain. Until very recently it was recognized only at London and Liverpool. In certain quarters the word is almost taboo. The inquiring visitor may be told that sociology cannot be a field for university study because it has no specialized subject matter, no core of unique knowledge, no techniques of its own. Where some such social analysis is recognized as desirable, circumlocutions are sought to describe it, and in some instances social anthropologists are employing what in America would be considered sociological methods. But a new day is dawning. Appointments in the field have been or are soon to be made at Oxford, Manchester, and Glasgow. At Cambridge the Faculty Board of Economics has an interest in this type of reading, and at Birmingham an American sociologist spent the Michaelmas term in 1948 as visiting lecturer.

A second contrast is in the realm of political science where there is much less research activity than in other fields. The journal *Politica* was a war casualty but *Public Administration* has survived. UNESCO is trying to promote an international organization of political scientists, and in the spring a small group of British scholars of politics met at Nuffield to explore the possibility of organizing a British unit for such a federation. Most political scientists are overburdened with teaching and there is little demand for postgraduate work because a man with a good B.A. degree can enter government service immediately without further training. Thus research suffers.

Certain similarities invite nostalgia, particularly in statistics and anthropology. In the latter field the social anthropologists find some opposition from those using the older techniques, even as in the United States. The contest is between those with the older concept of observing contemporary conditions among primitive peoples, with some archaeological exploration for skeletons and artifacts of the past, and the cultural evolutionists who would study contemporary advanced societies and who are upon occasion referred to somewhat slightly as "sociologists."

In statistics there is the chaos found in our own university circles. There is the same contest between the mathematical statisticians who insist on thorough training and the "practical" statisticians interested in simpli-

fied training for work in economics, psychology, biology, sociology, education, and the like. The Royal Statistical Society and other agencies are issuing reports and recommendations but they seem no nearer than Americans to resolving the dilemma of how to teach statistics, which are practical with respect to the time required, and yet not to neglect the mathematics which the real statistician should know.

Finally a few words about history in the British Isles: there appears the same uncertainty as in America as to whether history is a social science. Numerically, the political and constitutional historians are in the ascendant. As in the United States there is vigorous activity among the economic historians. One does not find as much particular evidence of interest in social, cultural, and intellectual history as in this country. Research organization is advancing, as witness the Institute of Historical Research at the University of London. Birmingham has an active School of History.

In the domain of history the war has been a stimulus; several war histories are in process. There are two groups of official histories, military and civil. The military histories are under the general editorship of J. R. M. Butler of Cambridge and the civil histories under that of W. K. Hancock of Oxford. Histories of civil affairs and military government are also being written. There are likewise certain accounts not forming part of the official histories. The historical sections attached to, and representing, the three Services sometime before the end of the war made arrangements for the preparation of narratives and studies, partly for their own tech-

nical purposes and partly to serve as the groundwork for the official historians of the war to be appointed.

Oxford and Cambridge are continuing their interest in multivolume cooperative histories. Oxford is publishing such a history of England, and Cambridge scholars plan to rewrite the *Cambridge Modern History* along lines of a new topical analysis.

The cause of American history is flourishing. Cambridge and Oxford each annually invite an American for a year's sojourn as visiting professor. At Cambridge American history is included among the fields for examination, and several of the colleges have fellows working in the field. At Oxford the subject has at length been included among undergraduate examination fields. London has the Commonwealth Fund professorship of American history in the person of Hugh H. Bellot, an English scholar holding a permanent appointment. Birmingham invites an American scholar to lecture annually during the Michaelmas term. Other universities are planning and hoping to secure teachers of the subject with Fulbright funds. The annual Anglo-American Historical Conference has been resumed and has been well attended.

One leaves England with a sense of having been witnessing the beginning of a new effort of great promise for social science research, if the human resources can be found. Trained personnel is the great need. Anglo-American interchange of scholarly visitation has been renewed and it is to be hoped that it will increase, under the stimulus of foundation grants and Fulbright aid. Social science research will be the better for it.

RESEARCH ON POLITICAL BEHAVIOR: REPORT OF A CONFERENCE

by Alexander Heard

In recent years research on political behavior has become an increasingly important part of the study of political science. The progress made suggests that much can be learned by continued exploration of the subject. At the same time, other disciplines have become concerned with aspects of political behavior research and have developed methods of study that seem to be useful. In an effort to advance research in this field, a conference of specialists from several disciplines was held at the University of Michigan between August 27 and September 2, 1949, under the joint auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the University's Department of Political Science, and the Institute for Social Research.

Some 29 social scientists spent a week discussing the ways their disciplines might contribute to the develop-

ment of political analysis. The participants included twenty political scientists, three anthropologists, three psychologists, two sociologists, and one statistician. In addition to the opening and closing luncheons, fifteen sessions were held. In four, political scientists discussed problems of method recently encountered in their own research. In seven, specialists from other disciplines described work they have been doing and its significance for the study of political behavior. In two sessions the conference broke up into small groups to consider the progress that had been made; in two later sessions these small groups reported their deliberations to the whole conference. Although the conference took no votes and adopted no resolutions, the participants were agreed that a number of important ideas useful

in the study of political behavior had been advanced. They felt that all the social sciences can contribute to developing skills in political analysis. It is part of the task of the student of politics to seek such contributions and apply them. Some of the principal suggestions made in the discussions are reported here.

It was argued that the processes of politics go on wherever men associate together. Political functions may be found in labor unions, in private associations, and in professional societies; and they should be studied in those settings as well as in political conventions and the halls of Congress. Studies have been made and others should be made of the way such organizations govern themselves and the ways in which their internal struggles for power are resolved. A study like Oliver Garceau's *The Political Life of the American Medical Association* (Harvard University Press, 1941) affords broader foundations for the study of such matters as leadership and decision making than do observations of governmental and purely "political" institutions alone.

The student of political behavior should not confine himself entirely to "formal institutions." In many informal relationships, such as those found among persons in the same social and financial circles, there are leader and follower relations that may reflect the real location of the governing authority of the community. In pursuit of the forces that mold political behavior the student should delve into whatever subject matter is pertinent. The study of southern politics, for example, is intimately concerned with the historical origins of racial attitudes and sectional self-consciousness, with the economic relationships between creditor merchants and debtor farmers, and with factors of topography and geography that determine the prevailing kinds of agriculture and industry and the political attitudes associated with them. In analyzing the effects of such conditions on political behavior the student may find it necessary to use research concepts and techniques developed outside political science. The influences of "subcultures" identified by the sociologist may aid, for example, in explaining the political conduct of an individual. Highly refined procedures of statistical correlation may point to otherwise obscure effects of demographic and social factors on the interest people show in voting and on the way they vote.

The psychologists and sociologists attending the conference suggested that concepts developed by their disciplines in research on other aspects of human behavior are pertinent in understanding political behavior. In the studies reported in *The American Soldier*,¹ for example, it was found that soldiers' expectations greatly

influenced the degree of satisfaction they felt in their lot. These studies also found that an individual's attitudes are much influenced by the "primary group" of which he is a member. The greenness of soldiers without battle experience wore off much more readily when they were placed in veteran platoons—the primary group in this instance—than when they were placed in green units with other soldiers who had not seen battle. It was thought that these two findings about human behavior are of the type that could be useful in understanding the formation and persistence of political attitudes.

Several participants suggested that research and interpretation in the study of political behavior of the type that produced *The American Soldier* would contribute enormously to the development of a "conceptual framework" of political understanding. A large number of intensive, independently executed studies of soldier conduct support the findings of *The American Soldier*. In the field of politics they are comparable to Herbert Tingsten's study of *Political Behavior* (P. S. King & Son, 1937). If a large number of descriptive studies such as Tingsten's were available, they could be integrated to develop a set of principles governing at least certain aspects of political behavior.

The discussions repeatedly emphasized the value of field investigation: much can be learned about political behavior by carefully observing the facts. V. O. Key's *Southern Politics* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1949) was reviewed as an example of political analysis that had made substantial use of field investigation. Much information was obtained by asking politicians directly how they conducted their affairs and why they did so in the ways they did. Information on such subjects as the application of statutes, the financing of political campaigns, and the organizing of Negroes for political action could be obtained only by extensive field work.

Some of the specialists from disciplines other than political science described types of field investigations that might be pertinent to the study of politics. The techniques of research used by William F. Whyte in *Street Corner Society* (University of Chicago Press, 1943) were examined in detail. He joined the "Cornerville Social and Athletic Club" in order to observe directly the interpersonal relations of the members. He carefully recorded the frequency with which individual members associated with other members and observed the relationships of deference between them. He was able to construct the informal hierarchy of influence existing among the members that was distinct from the formal hierarchy of the club's officers. Such a technique applied, for example, to restricted sections of a political

¹ See the publications listed on page 47, *infra*.

party might make it possible to identify obscure or complicated lines of authority.

In addition to intensive inquiries of this kind, many of the conference participants saw considerable value in extensive surveys. Planning the study of political behavior over a region, such as New England, points up the areas of research most in need of intensive work. Moreover, the extensive approach permits comparative studies. Great emphasis was laid on the value of the contrasts that are revealed by comparative analyses. The simultaneous study of 11 southern states by Key permitted greater insight into the factionalism of the Democratic party in each state than could have been obtained by the study of a single state alone. The psychologists reported that they had found it extremely useful in comparative studies to "maximize the variables." In the study of the effect of economic status on voter participation, for instance, any relationship present can be detected most readily by choosing areas for study in which, with other important factors approximately equal, the disparity in economic status is very wide. The same principle enhances the value of studying any sharply contrasting situations.

The anthropologists advocated extension of the comparative method to the study of political behavior in widely differing cultural situations. They thought that the study of politics should be made more nearly universal than its present orientation to modern western civilization permits. The study of political behavior and political institutions among primitive tribes, for example, would provide a more nearly adequate basis for the formulation of "true" generalizations. The Human Relations Area Files, Inc. centered at Yale University may be of increasing usefulness to political scientists in locating studies by anthropologists and others of various aspects of political behavior in remote cultural settings.

The survey research procedures of the Institute for Social Research were viewed as having much potential value in the study of political phenomena. Quantitative techniques such as those used by the Institute are complex and can normally be applied only by trained specialists. To varying extents this condition holds true with respect to research tools, or research "approaches," of other disciplines that may profitably be employed in political analysis. As a consequence, it was proposed that joint research projects engaging the services of social scientists from two or more disciplines are necessary, and that such a project should soon be undertaken as a practical exercise in interdisciplinary study of political behavior.

The 1952 national election was mentioned as a suitable object of collaborative study by political scientists,

psychologists, and others in an effort to identify factors that influence voting behavior. A sample of 100 counties might be studied. Each county would be investigated intensively to identify the characteristics that might have a bearing on voting behavior. Such characteristics would range from the nature of local political machines and economic activities in the county to the kinds of pre-election campaigns carried on in it. In getting this information various techniques would be used. For example, historical data pertaining to the political organizations of the county would be gathered from secondary sources, newspapers, election returns, interviews, and the like. Survey sampling techniques would be used to determine electioneering pressures operating on individual voters, such as solicitation by friends and the policies of nonpolitical associations of which they are members. All the characteristics of the county and subcounty areas would be coded. By correlation with political performance an effort would be made to get at causal factors. The sentiment of the conference endorsed a pioneer project of this kind if it could be adequately financed.

The consensus of the conference favored the use by students of politics of promising research materials and research methods from whatever source. It was suggested that in the training of political scientists greater attention should be given to such research tools as statistical analysis and the interview and to research concepts developed in other fields. Cooperative research projects employing candidates for graduate degrees in several disciplines might be used as training devices. The political scientists in attendance recognized that they had been using a substantial number of the procedures recommended by their colleagues without being conscious of them as specially identified research techniques. They agreed that more deliberate attention to problems of method would be rewarding in political research.

The student of politics should seek help wherever he can find it. The view was repeatedly expressed, however, that the problems of political research that can be solved by exclusively quantitative methods are limited. The multipurpose nature of society gives to the political process complexity and depth beyond the nature of industrial organizations and other restricted phenomena with clearly recognizable objectives, which have been studied by quantitative methods with notable success. The central responsibility for the study of political behavior necessarily rests with the political scientist. It is he who must integrate the products of all approaches in the study of politics into the body of political information and theory that has already been developed.

Program: CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH ON POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

August 27, Luncheon

PURPOSE AND PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE
James K. Pollock, University of Michigan
Pendleton Herring, Social Science Research Council

Afternoon

REPORT ON NEW ENGLAND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR PROJECT
Oliver Garceau, Bennington College
Dayton D. McKean, Dartmouth College
David B. Truman, Williams College

Evening

REPORT ON STUDY OF SOUTHERN POLITICS
V. O. Key, Yale University
Alexander Heard, University of Alabama

August 28, Morning

A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO POLITICS
Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Columbia University

Evening

POSSIBILITY OF A GENERAL SOCIAL SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT
George P. Murdock, Yale University

August 29, Morning

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
John Gillin, University of North Carolina

Evening

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL COMMUNITY STUDY
Omer C. Stewart, University of Colorado

August 30, Morning

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND VOTING BEHAVIOR
Donald Hecock, Wayne University

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND VOTING BEHAVIOR
OF THE URBAN ELECTORATE
Samuel Eldersveld, University of Michigan

Afternoon

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Evening

REPORTS ON GROUP DISCUSSIONS

August 31, Morning

PRE-ELECTION POLLS OF 1948
Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton University

Afternoon

STUDIES OF POLITICAL INFORMATION, INVOLVEMENT,
AND ATTITUDES
Angus Campbell, University of Michigan

Evening

PROBLEMS OF PREDICTION
Rensis Likert, University of Michigan

September 1, Morning

ORGANIZED GROUPS AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOR
Avery Leiserson, University of Chicago
David B. Truman, Williams College
William F. Whyte, Cornell University

Afternoon

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

September 2, Morning

REPORTS ON GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Luncheon

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS
James K. Pollock, University of Michigan
Pendleton Herring, Social Science Research Council

The other participants in the conference were: George Belknap, University of Michigan; Alfred de Grazia, University of Minnesota; O. F. Freitag, University of Denver; W. L. Hindman, University of Southern California; John W. Lederle, University of Michigan; Neil A. McDonald, New Jersey College for Women; John A. Perkins, University of Michigan; Joseph C. Pray, University of Oklahoma; M. Brewster Smith, Vassar College; Richard Snyder, Princeton University; Hubert Wilson, Princeton University.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCE OF RESEARCH BRANCH, INFORMATION AND EDUCATION DIVISION, ASF

Frederick Osborn (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Leland C. DeVinney, Carl I. Hovland, John M. Russell, Samuel A. Stouffer.

Measurement and Prediction, Volume IV of *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, by Samuel A. Stouffer, Louis Guttman, Edward A. Suchman, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Shirley A. Star, and John A. Clausen is scheduled for publication by the Princeton University Press soon after the first of the year. This volume is a scientific report on the methods developed in the studies made by the Research Branch. It is the final volume in the series prepared under the auspices of the committee and brings its program to a close.

CONFERENCE BOARD OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH COUNCILS

(Joint with American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, and National Research Council)

Ross G. Harrison (chairman), Detlev W. Bronk, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, Pendleton Herring, Cornelius Krusé, Roy F. Nichols, Charles E. Odegard, George F. Zook; secretary, Paul Webbink.

The board on November 3 selected the following as members of the committee to direct its project on human resources and fields of higher learning: Charles E. Odegard, American Council of Learned Societies (chairman); Arthur S. Adams, University of New Hampshire; Donald Bridgman, American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; Aaron J. Brumbaugh, American Council on Education; Cornelius

W. de Kiewiet, Cornell University; Quinn McNemar, Stanford University; Kenneth E. Oberholtzer, superintendent of schools, Denver; Ralph A. Sawyer, University of Michigan; Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton University; M. H. Trytten, National Research Council; Paul Webbink, Social Science Research Council; and Malcolm M. Willey, University of Minnesota. The committee will be responsible, with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, for a continuing appraisal of existing and emergency personnel problems in fields of higher learning, for the stimulation of relevant research, and for bringing significant problems and research findings to the attention of university, government, and other officials. An initial meeting of the committee, at which the selection of staff and other organizational problems will be considered, is to be held in December.

The Conference Board designated Charles F. Voegelin of Indiana University as a member of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, to replace Horace M. Miner who will be abroad during most of the year. The committee is the instrumentality through which the board cooperates in administration of the Fulbright program.

ECONOMIC HISTORY

Arthur H. Cole (chairman), Carter Goodrich, Earl J. Hamilton, Herbert Heaton, John G. B. Hutchins, Harold A. Innis, Leland H. Jenks, Edward C. Kirkland, Frederic C. Lane, Robert Warren.

The committee is taking an active interest in the informal group of doctoral candidates working with Carter Goodrich at Columbia University in the general field of the relation of government to American economic development—one of the areas of concentration originally selected for promotion by the committee. Mr. Goodrich was appointed a member of the committee in September. Three new grants have been made by the committee: one to Philip W. Bishop of Yale University to aid in completion of his history of the Scovill Manufacturing Company; one to Frederic C. Lane of Johns Hopkins University to cover editorial costs of his projected volume on the scope and method of economic history; and one to the *Journal of Economic History* to aid in its publication for one year. At its September meeting the committee heard an informal report on current research on economic history in Europe by T. S. Ashton of the London School of Economics.

A. H. C.

HOUSING RESEARCH

Ernest M. Fisher (chairman), Charles S. Ascher, Jacob H. Beuscher, Howard G. Brunsman, Nicholas J. Demerath, Robert K. Merton, Robert B. Mitchell, Richard U. Ratcliff, Arthur M. Weimer, Coleman Woodbury; *staff*, Leo Grebler.

"Production of New Housing," a monograph on research problems in housing production prepared for the committee by Leo Grebler, has been accepted for publication by the Council. It will be ready for distribution early in

1950. The monograph is particularly concerned with needed research on factors affecting the efficiency of housing production. Since November 1 Mr. Grebler has been serving as part-time staff for the committee.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

AMONG SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Roy F. Nichols (chairman), Frederick S. Dunn, Robert B. Hall, Otto Klineberg, Donald Young; *staff*, Richard H. Heindel.

The committee was appointed in September to advise the Council on the broad range of problems in international communication and cooperation among social scientists on which the Council's aid has been increasingly sought by government and other agencies. There are many opportunities to be of assistance to the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, on which the Council is represented by Frederick S. Dunn, and to the Commission's Program Committee on which Pendleton Herring has just succeeded Donald Young. Opportunities to further the development of international relationships among social scientists are also presented in the Fulbright program, and other programs under the Department of State.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON PRICE POLICIES

Leonard A. Doyle (chairman), J. S. Bain, Ralph Cassady, Jr., E. T. Grether, John A. Guthrie, Roy W. Jastram, Vernon A. Mund, Robert B. Pettengill.

The implications of recent antitrust decisions by the U. S. Supreme Court and the attitude of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice were discussed at the annual meeting of the committee held at Berkeley on September 5-7. With reference to the history of the price policy of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Morris Adelman of Massachusetts Institute of Technology considered the view that mere size of a firm is an economic and social evil, and the importance of tests of consumer welfare on such points as low prices and efficient service. Questions were raised as to whether business firms in the future would be hesitant in exploring through reduced prices the possibilities of increasing volume, and whether such hesitation might lead to relatively higher prices and greater restriction of output. In a discussion of the decisions on the basing point system, the majority of the members considered that an attempt to outlaw freight absorption in industrial pricing practice would be impractical, but there was also vigorous dissent to this view.

Richard Heflebower of Northwestern University reviewed his research methods and findings in a study of industrial pricing practices in the washing machine, edible vegetable oil, and rolled oat cereal industries. He emphasized the importance of multiproduct lines and various market strata in providing a more realistic element of price flexibility than many writers have attributed to industrial prices. Mr. Heflebower's study will be published by the Brookings Insti-

tution. Kenneth Naden, of the Division of Agricultural Economics at the University of California at Los Angeles, discussed the pricing and production policies of an agricultural cooperative acting as sales agent for its member producer cooperatives. Leonard A. Doyle discussed briefly the evidence developed by the cost records of a rolling mill with respect to the existence of constant unit variable costs throughout the entire range of output experienced in the postwar period.

L. A. D.

SOUTHERN ASIA

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

W. Norman Brown (chairman), Kingsley Davis, Franklin Edgerton, John F. Embree, Holden Furber, David G. Mandelbaum, Horace I. Poleman, Lauriston Sharp; *secretary*, Alice Thorner.

The committee has completed plans for a conference on Southern Asia studies to be held at the University of Pennsylvania on December 2-4. The purpose of the conference is to analyze the needs of these studies in the United States as a step toward drawing up a program for a well-rounded development of this field. The chairman of the committee reports that about 50 persons are expected to attend from colleges and universities, councils and foundations, museums, government, and business. The conference will consider research projects, instructional programs, personnel, library and museum facilities, problems of field work, exchange of students and scholars, and cultural relations between the United States and the countries of Southern Asia.

W. I. THOMAS' CONTRIBUTIONS

TO SOCIAL SCIENCE

Donald Young (chairman), Herbert Blumer, Thorsten Sellin, Dorothy S. Thomas.

During the past year Dorothy S. Thomas turned over to the Council all her rights in W. I. Thomas' publications. The Council subsequently appointed a committee to investigate the possibility of reviewing and integrating Thomas' major contributions to sociological and social-psychological theory and method, and of making available a selection of his out-of-print and some unpublished materials. During the summer Edmund H. Volkart of the Department of Sociology at Yale University prepared for the committee a prospectus of a volume which would serve these two purposes. This prospectus was discussed and amplified by the committee at a meeting on October 22, and plans were made for selection and annotation by Mr. Volkart of excerpts from Thomas' books and reprints of articles most pertinent to the development, significance, and influence of his views. Contributions by Herbert Blumer and E. W. Burgess and a complete bibliography of W. I. Thomas' works would comprise the remainder of a volume which would make readily accessible his outstanding contributions to the study of social behavior and personality. The committee at its meeting also discussed with Marvin Bressler his program under an SSRC research training fellowship for analysis of "trouble letters," based on a study incomplete at the time of W. I. Thomas' death. Dr. Max Weinreich of the Yiddish Scientific Institute is serving as Mr. Bressler's adviser in this program.

PERSONNEL

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

At a meeting of the Committee on Social Science Personnel on October 15 the following research training fellowships were awarded:

- Donald J. Berthrong, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Wisconsin, for further training in social sciences and for research on social legislation.
- George H. Borts, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Chicago, for further training in econometrics and research on a production function for the railroad industry.
- Marvin Bressler, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Pennsylvania, for analysis of "trouble letters" based on W. I. Thomas' unfinished study.
- J. Melvin Edelstein, Ph.D. candidate in history, Johns Hopkins University, for research in Italy on the politics of the Florentine Republic.
- Richard T. Morris, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Ohio State University, for study at Columbia University and elsewhere and research on effects of status differences on behavior.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIP

Since making the appointments listed in the September *Items*, the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships has made one additional award:

- Clifton B. Kroeber, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of California, for research in South America on trade and navigation in the Plata River system from the eighteenth century to the present.

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

A Pacific Coast Committee on Old Age Research, consisting initially of Harold E. Jones (chairman), Lloyd Fisher, and Clark Kerr, all of the University of California, Ray E. Baber of Pomona College, Roy M. Dorcus of the University of California at Los Angeles, Oscar Kaplan of San Diego State College, and Elon Moore of the University of Oregon, has been appointed for the year 1949-50.

Earl Latham of Amherst College and George W. Stocking of Vanderbilt University have been named to the Com-

mittee on Grants-in-Aid. The other members are Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul W. Gates, and John W. Riley, Jr.

Edward P. Hutchinson of the University of Pennsylvania has been named chairman of the Committee on Social Science Personnel, which has charge of the Council's research training fellowship program. W. W. Hill of the University of New Mexico and Richard H. Shryock of Johns Hopkins University are newly appointed members, and Donald T. Campbell, Frank A. Southard, Jr., and Paul Webbink have been reappointed to the committee for 1949-50.

Melville J. Herskovits of Northwestern University has been appointed to the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships, succeeding Walter L. Wright, Jr. (deceased).

Lauriston Sharp of Cornell University has been named as substitute for Morris E. Opler on the Committee on Economic Growth during his absence from the country.

Willard Hurst of the University of Wisconsin, John A. Perkins of the University of Michigan, and Arnold Wolfers of Yale University have been appointed to the Committee on Organization for Research.

COUNCIL DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND STAFF

At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council held in September, Donald G. Marquis of the University of Michigan and Malcolm M. Willey of the University of Minnesota were elected directors-at-large for the two-year term 1950-51. Robert B. Hall and Frederick Osborn were re-elected for the same term.

Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania was elected chairman of the board of directors; Robert R. Sears of Harvard University, vice-chairman; Willard Hurst of the

University of Wisconsin, secretary; and Lyle H. Lanier of New York University, treasurer. The following members of the board were elected as its Executive Committee: J. Frederic Dewhurst of the Twentieth Century Fund (chairman), Wendell C. Bennett of Yale University, Shepard B. Clough and Arthur W. Macmahon of Columbia University, and Donald Young of the Russell Sage Foundation. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. of Cornell University was named chairman of the Committee on Problems and Policy, and Joseph J. Spengler of Duke University was elected a member. The other members of this committee are E. W. Burgess, Carl I. Hovland, Don K. Price, S. S. Wilks, and ex officio: Pendleton Herring, Roy F. Nichols, and Robert R. Sears.

Richard H. Heindel, formerly of the University of Pennsylvania and Staff Associate of the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, joined the Council staff as Executive Associate on October 1, with headquarters in the Washington office. Mr. Heindel is particularly concerned with development of the Council's activities in the international field, including the work of the new Committee on International Cooperation among Social Scientists, the Council's participation in preliminary screening of applicants for research awards under the Fulbright Act, and development of the programs of the Committees on World Area Research and International Relations Research.

Gerald Breese, who served as staff of the Committee on Housing Research for two years, and John G. Turnbull, who was engaged in staff work for the Committee on Labor Market Research during the same period, resigned at the beginning of the current academic year. Mr. Breese is now a member of the Department of Economics and Social Institutions at Princeton University, and Mr. Turnbull has joined the faculty of the School of Business Administration at the University of Minnesota.

PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. I, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* by S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeViney, S. A. Star, and R. M. Williams, Jr.; Vol. II, *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath* by S. A. Stouffer, A. A. Lumsdaine, M. H. Lumsdaine, R. M. Williams, Jr., M. B. Smith, I. L. Janis, S. A. Star, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr.; Vol. III, *Experiments on Mass Communication* by C. I. Hovland, A. A. Lumsdaine, and F. D. Sheffield. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Analysis of Experience of Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Vol. I, 612 pp.; Vol. II, 676 pp.; together, \$13.50; separately, \$7.50. Vol. III, 356 pp., \$5.00. *Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945: A Supplement to the Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Prepared by the Bureau of the Census with the cooperation of the Committee on Economic His-

tory and the Advisory Committee on a Source Book of Historical Statistics. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949. 371 pp. \$2.50. Orders should be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C.

The Library's Public by Bernard Berelson (194 pp., \$3.00); *Government Publications for the Citizen* by James L. McCamy (153 pp., \$2.50); *The Book Industry* by William Miller (170 pp., \$2.75); *The Information Film* by Gloria Waldron (299 pp., \$3.75). Prepared under the auspices of the Public Library Inquiry Committee, the last-named volume in cooperation with the Twentieth Century Fund. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

SSRC BULLETIN SERIES

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman,

with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00. *Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum*, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

All numbers in the Council's bulletin and pamphlet series are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

MEMORANDA

Music Materials and the Public Library by Otto Luening; *Work Measurement in Public Libraries* by Watson O'D. Pierce. Reports to the Director of the Public Library Inquiry. 87 and 243 pp. respectively. Mimeographed. \$1.00 each. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

ANNOUNCEMENT

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

The current fellowship and grant programs of the Council will continue for the coming year.

Research training fellowships are offered to holders of the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent in social science and to candidates for that degree who have fulfilled all requirements except the thesis. These fellowships are intended to afford more advanced research training than that provided in the usual Ph.D. program. Preference is given to training programs involving participation in research under the active guidance of mature research workers; fellowships are not offered to support the pursuit of normally required courses or the writing of dissertations which do not involve additional research training. Basic stipends of \$2,500 per year for predoctoral and \$3,500 for postdoctoral fellows will be supplemented by allowances for support of dependents and for travel or other necessary expenses of training, or reduced to take account of partial support from other sources.

Area research training fellowships are offered for advanced training in preparation for research closely related to understanding of the contemporary culture of a major world area outside North America. Possession of the Ph.D. degree, preferably in social science, or fulfillment of all requirements for that degree except the thesis is prerequisite. Normally fellows will work in the area of their special interest, but preparatory study or research in the United States or elsewhere may be justified in some cases. Basic stipends will be comparable to those of the research training fellowships; allowance will be made for current regional differences in living and travel costs.

Travel grants for area research are offered to mature scholars of established competence as specialists on the con-

temporary culture of a major world area outside North America, to enable them to visit the area of interest for a period of about a year, or longer. The grants cover actual travel and research costs only, and are usually given to supplement maintenance allowances from other sources. Travel grants are not offered to candidates for academic degrees. The maximum grant is \$2,500.

Grants-in-aid of research not exceeding \$1,500 are offered to mature social scientists to meet expenses of their own research projects. Grants-in-aid are not offered to candidates for academic degrees, and are not available either to subsidize the publication of manuscripts or to provide income in lieu of salary. Preference is given to applicants affiliated with institutions which are unable to provide financial aid for research by members of their staffs.

Closing dates for receipt of applications are given below, followed in parentheses by the expected times of announcing awards:

Research training fellowships	January 16 (March), April 24 (June), August 15 (October)
Area fellowships and travel grants	March 13 (May), September 18 (November)
Grants-in-aid	January 16 (April).

Inquiries and requests for a circular giving fuller details may be addressed to the Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

National fellowships in economic history are administered separately by the Council's Committee on Economic History. Inquiries may be addressed to the chairman of the committee, Dr. Arthur H. Cole, Box 37, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1949: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, E. W. BURGESS, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, PHILIP M. HAUSER, PENDLETON HERRING, CARL I. HOVLAND, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, CLYDE KLUCKHOHN, LYLE H. LANIER, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, ARTHUR W. MACMAHON, CHARLES E. MERRIAM, ROY F. NICHOLS, J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, FREDERICK OSBORN, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, GEORGE W. STOCKING, WILLARD L. THORP, RALPH W. TYLER, S. S. WILKS, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; RICHARD H. HEINDEL, *Executive Associate*; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; CALVIN W. STILLMAN; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*

